



**STATE OF NEW JERSEY**

In the Matter of Lucas Greenwood,  
County Correctional Police Officer  
(S9999A), Camden County

**FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION  
OF THE  
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION**

CSC Docket No. 2021-1653

List Removal Appeal

**ISSUED: SEPTEMBER 7, 2021 (SLK)**

Lucas Greenwood appeals his removal from the eligible list for County Correctional Police Officer (S9999A), Camden County for failing to complete pre-employment processing.

The appellant took the open competitive examination for County Correctional Police Officer (S9999A), achieved a passing score, and was ranked on the subsequent eligible list. In seeking his removal, the appointing authority indicated that the appellant failed to complete pre-employment processing.

On appeal, the appellant states when he was offered the subject position, he was advised that he had to do a two-day medical screening. However, one of the dates was during a family vacation that was planned before the employment offer. Therefore, he indicates that he e-mailed an Officer to see if he could reschedule and told the Officer that if it was not possible to reschedule, he would not go on vacation. The appellant presents that the Officer replied that he could not reschedule his appointment, but he could ask at the medical screening if he could reschedule. He states that he attended the screening on August 14, 2020, and spoke to the medical provider. The provider informed him to call when he returned from vacation and it would set up a different appointment. The next week the appellant indicates that he received a call from an Officer stating that he was no longer eligible since he did not

attend the medical screening. In reply, the appellant states that he advised the Officer that he did attend and was told that he could change his appointment. Thereafter, he presents that the medical provider called stating that if he could get in that day, it could process his screening. However, the appellant was seven hours away and was not able to make it before the office closed. He asserts that if he had been advised that rescheduling was not an option, he would not have gone on vacation and he would have attended the screening.

In response, the appointing authority submits a chain of e-mails that demonstrate that the appellant did not follow-up with the medical provider to reschedule the second part of the medical screening. It emphasizes that the appellant was clearly advised that he was to set up the follow-up appointment. The appointing authority presents that the e-mails indicate that as of August 25, 2020, the medical provider had not received a call from the appellant to complete the process.

### CONCLUSION

*N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-4.7(a)11 allows the Civil Service Commission (Commission) to remove an eligible's name from an eligible list for other valid reasons. *N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-6.3(b), in conjunction with *N.J.A.C.* 4A:4-4.7(d), provides that the appellant has the burden of proof to show by a preponderance of the evidence that an appointing authority's decision to remove his name from an eligible list was in error.

A review of the record indicates that the appointing authority's request to remove the appellant's name from the subject eligible list on the basis of his failure to complete preemployment processing was justified. In this regard, the appellant indicates that he attended the first day of a two-day medical screening on Friday, August 14, 2020, asking if he could reschedule the second day of the screening, which was originally scheduled for August 17, 2020. The appellant was to call the medical provider when he returned from vacation to set-up the second-day appointment. However, as indicated by the medical provider's e-mails, as of Tuesday, August 25, 2020, the appellant did not call to reschedule the second-day appointment. Accordingly, the appellant has not met his burden of proof, and the appointing authority has shown sufficient justification for removing his name from the subject eligible list.

### ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that this appeal be denied.

This is the final administrative determination in this matter. Any further review should be pursued in a judicial forum.

DECISION RENDERED BY THE  
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ON  
THE 1<sup>ST</sup> DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2021

*Deirdre' L. Webster Cobb*

---

Deirdré L. Webster Cobb  
Chairperson  
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries

and

Correspondence

Allison Chris Myers  
Division of Appeals  
& Regulatory Affairs  
Civil Service Commission  
Written Record Appeals Unit  
P.O. Box 312  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

c: Lucas Greenwood  
Catherine Binowski  
Division of Agency Services